UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,139	03/06/2007	Shinichiro Yamada	09792909-6492	2702
	7590 05/29/200 EIN NATH & ROSEN'	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 0610	080	LEE, DORIS L		
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1796		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Occurrence	10/596,139	YAMADA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Doris L. Lee	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	<i>-</i>						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	lection requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		d.					
Attachment(s)	_						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

- 2. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.
 - Group 1, claim(s) 1-12, drawn to a first resin composition comprising a
 polysaccharide and flame retardant additive containing a hydroxide, and a
 hydrolysis suppressing agent.
 - Group 2, claim(s) 13-15, drawn to a product made from the first resin composition.
 - Group 3, claim(s) 16, drawn to a method of making the first resin composition.
 - Group 4, claim(s) 17-19, drawn to a second resin composition containing at least at least one biodegradable polysaccharide, a flame retardant additive containing at least one of an inorganic flame retardant compound, a boric acid based flame retardant compound, a halogen-based flame retardant compound, an organic flame retardant compound, a colloid-based flame retardant compound and a nitrogen-based flame retardant compound, and a hydrolysis suppressing agent for suppressing the hydrolysis of said at least one polysaccharide.
 - Group 5, claim(s) 20-22, drawn to a product made from the second resin composition.

 Group 6, claim(s) 23, drawn to a method of making the second resin composition.

The inventions listed as Groups 1-6 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the technical feature which links and unifies the inventions, namely resin composition comprising a polysaccharide and flame retardant additive, and a hydrolysis suppressing agent does not offer contribution over the prior art as evidenced by Shinichiro et al (JP 2003-192925, Derwent abstract). Therefore, the inventions lack a special technical feature.

3. A telephone call was made to David Metzger on May 12, 2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doris L. Lee whose telephone number is (571)270-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am to 5 pm and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571)272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DLL 5/22/08

/VASUDEVAN S. JAGANNATHAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796